

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KATHERINE WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

No. C 08-00026 WHA

v.

JOHN E. POTTER,  
POSTMASTER GENERAL,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER DENYING  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR REVIEW OF DISMISSAL**

This *pro se* employment action was settled at a settlement conference held before Magistrate Judge Maria-Elena James in January 2009. Plaintiff subsequently filed three requests for relief from her decision to settle. All were denied because plaintiff had entered a valid, binding settlement. Plaintiff now moves yet again for relief from the settlement, this time on the grounds that defendant did not comply with the terms of settlement. Specifically, plaintiff argues that pursuant to the settlement, defendant was to deliver a settlement check to plaintiff by noon on April 2, 2009. Although defendant attempted to comply by delivering the check to her door on March 31, 2009, plaintiff refused to accept delivery. Plaintiff admits that defendant thereafter timely left the check in her mailbox on April 1, 2009, but she argues that this delivery was "null and void" because the check was not mailed through the postal service. Plaintiff's argument is nonsensical. She has not stated a valid ground for relief from the settlement into which she voluntarily entered. Nor has she brought her motion for relief within

1 a reasonable time. The case has been closed for more than a year. Her motion is therefore

2 **DENIED.**

3

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5

6 Dated: May 12, 2010.

7



---

WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28